IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE TWENTY SIXTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE DR JUSTICE G.YETHIRAJULU

WRIT PETITION NO : 2621 of 2005

Between:

C. Maha Lakshmi, W/o. Sesharao,
H.C.M. Girls Junior College (H.S), Ongole, Prakasam District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The State of Andhra Pradesh, Represented by its Secretary,
Education Department, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
2 The Commissioner and Director of School Education, Andhra Pradesh,

Saifabad, Hyderabad.
3 The Regional Joint Director of School Education, Guntur, Guntur District.
4 The Correspondent, H.C.M. Girls Junior College (H.S),
Ongole, Prakasam District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to pass orders, particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the inaction of the respondents in approving the selection and appointment of the petitioner in spite of the lapse of 18 months as arbitrary, illegal, discriminatory, violative of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India, and contrary to Rule 12(8) of A.P. Education Institution Establishment, Recruitment, Administration and control of schools under private Management) Rules, 1993, and consequently direct the Respondents to approve the appointment and pay the salary and allowances to the petitioner with effect from 28-8-2003, and grant such other relief as this Honourable High Court may deem fit and proper

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.KASAJAGANMOHAN REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 to 4: GP FOR EDUCATION

The Court made the following :

ORDER:

The petitioner is contending that she has been working as a School Assistant since 28-8-2003 by virtue of an appointment given to her after the selection made by a committee duly authorized to make the selection. The 4th respondent submitted a list of appointed candidates for approval of the 3rd respondent through the District Educational Officer. The grievance of the petitioner is that the 3rd respondent kept the matter pending and no orders have been passed on the proposal made by the 4th respondent for approval.

In the counter affidavit of respondents 1 to 3, there is a mention that there are certain clarifications sought for in respect of other candidates included in the list and that appropriate orders would be passed after getting the clarifications regarding their appointments.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that no objections have been raised in so far as the case of the petitioner is concerned and therefore, a specific direction may be given to the 3rd respondent to approve the name of the petitioner irrespective of the clarifications in respect of other candidates.

In the light of the above circumstances, the 3rd respondent is directed to examine the matter and pass appropriate orders on the proposal sent by the District Educational Officer, on the basis of the selections made by the committee for aided post according to rules, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

The writ petition is disposed of accordingly. No costs.

_____

26-04-2005

rkk

To

1 The State of Andhra Pradesh, Represented by its Secretary,
Education Department, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
2 The Commissioner and Director of School Education, Andhra Pradesh,

Saifabad, Hyderabad.
3 The Regional Joint Director of School Education, Guntur, Guntur District.
4 The Correspondent, H.C.M. Girls Junior College (H.S),
Ongole, Prakasam District.

5 Two CCs to GP for Education, High Court of AP, Hyderabad.

6 Two CD copies.